

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JULY, 1911

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, California, Maryland, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thirty-nine Branch Committees; 15,751* members in 349 cities, towns, and villages.

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building,
Boston.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the state

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

THE annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, was held on May 3rd, at the home of Mrs. J. B. Millet, 77 Mt. Vernon street. The President of the Association, Miss Mary S. Ames, in a brief address of welcome, drew special encouragement from the fact that the aggressive and sensational methods of the suffragists during the past year have roused the sentiment of conservative women to a fuller and bolder expression than ever before, as the marked increase of interest in the work plainly shows. Reports were read by the Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, and the Treasurer,

Mrs. James M. Codman; and the roll of Branches, called by the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong showed a large representation in attendance.

Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Chairman of the Organization and Education Committee, reported a net gain in the membership of the Association of 269 after allowing for the loss of 150 by death, 9 by resignation, and 57 by removal from the state. The membership now stands at 15,586.¹ It has gained greatly in distribution, since we now have members in 349 cities, towns or villages, as against 299 last year. New Branch Committees have been formed in Jamaica Plain, Plymouth, Winchester, Greenfield and Springfield. The formation of a Junior League of girls under twenty-one is welcomed with appreciation by older workers. A Study Class under the leadership of the Secretary of the Organization Committee, Mrs. A. J. George, has been meeting regularly for the last three months in Boston, and has done effective work in keeping its members alert and informed, and it is hoped that such classes may be formed in many of the Branches.

The activity of college graduates in this year's work has been especially noticeable and gratifying. Another feature of interest has been the number of appeals for a speaker to present the anti-suffrage view to clubs and other organizations where a suffragist had already been heard.

Mrs. Putnam spoke, also, of the work carried on from the office at Room 615, Kensington Building. There has been an increase of over 100 per cent in the requests received for literature. They have come from

¹ Since the annual meeting 165 new members have joined the Association, making the total 15,751.

37 states, the District of Columbia and Canada. Three new and valuable additions have been made to our list of pamphlets for circulation: "Wage-Earning Women and the State," by Miss Minnie Bronson, formerly Special Agent of the Bureau of Labor at Washington; "Woman Suffrage," a paper by ex-Justice Brown of the Supreme Court of the United States; and a compilation entitled "Some Rights and Exemptions Given to Women by Massachusetts Law." A new edition of "Opinions of Eminent Persons," has also been prepared.

Officers were elected as follows: President, Miss Mary S. Ames; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Brookline; Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong; Executive Committee, the above officers and Mrs. Martin L. Cate, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Miss Elizabeth McCracken, Miss L. C. Post, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Mrs. Robert S. Russell and Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier.

Mrs. Grace Duffield Goodwin of Washington, D. C.,

gave an address on "Why I am an anti-suffragist." She said in part:

We claim that women are intellectually able to perform the duties and to assume the responsibilities of law-making and law-enforcing, but that they are unfitted for this physically and mentally. The sex factor, set contemptuously aside by the suffragists, nevertheless is to be reckoned with, and every woman of us all must frankly admit that our en-

durance and vital force are already sadly strained. The state already recognizes us as citizens, by virtue of service as mothers and homemakers, and we have not been denied the privilege of the ballot but exempted from its responsibility. When we demand men's work to do in addition to our own, we are pertinently asked, "where is your proved surplus of physical strength and nervous energy?" and we know we have none.

The working woman with her wrongs offers a field for the sentimental suffragist. My own experience in several New England mill towns convinces me that the working women have no interest in the ballot, as they have very little interest in their own industrial careers, knowing them to be, for the most part, temporary and uncertain. The laws made in aid of women and children will never be made by the help of working women, but by the disinterested, unpartisan aid of intelligent women who have far more influence when they are outside party lines. Without the ballot, we are at the fountain head of power. We have children to educate, along lines of patriotism and common sense.

The present debauched condition of the franchise is largely due to the fact that neither in school nor at home are boys trained for their business in the life of the state. They do not realize the shame of the purchased ballot. We shall most truly serve our country by inciting the best and most intelligent women of the land, the women who would be in a hopeless minority as voters, to renewed zeal in the influencing of public sentiment and in the education of the young. The illiterate women would outvote us again and again and would add strength to every evil cause; we can outvoice them everywhere.

This denial of the ballot to the sex may work individual injustice and hardship. Many intelligent women cannot vote even when they own property, and the humblest man in their employ can do so. True. But for the relief of these comparatively few women, why should we plunge the entire nation into disorder? Every humane law—even the law against kidnapping—has been known to work wrong in individual instances. The whole matter is one of patriotism; not one of selfish, personal interest. This

thing would be a hindrance and a menace to the country in the present political conditions; therefore I do not want it for myself or for other women and therefore I shall work against it, recognizing that patriotism in this case means active opposition to an unpatriotic demand.

MORE TESTIMONY FROM COLORADO

WHEN Mrs. Francis W. Goddard, President of the Colonial Dames of Colorado, frankly declared in *The Ladies Home Journal*, that the experiment of woman suffrage in her state was a failure, and that the best thing that could happen, for the state or for women, would be to have it immediately abolished, she became the object of suffrage vituperation everywhere.

But it appears that she does not by any means stand alone; and other Colorado women of undisputed social and civic prominence challenge suffrage attacks by making similar statements. For example, Miss Mary Mackenzie Gambrill of Colorado Springs, writes:

I cannot see that suffrage has purified politics, or placed better men in office, or has been productive of any legislation beneficial to either women or children. I think women are too hysterical, too personal in feeling, and not well enough balanced to exercise the right of suffrage. And their attitude in all these discussions proves the truth of my opinion.

Mrs. Chaloner B. Schley, of Colorado Springs, although still a believer in woman suffrage in theory, writes that, practically, after watching it for many years in Colorado, she considers it a failure. She adds:

I can see nothing that it has accomplished in its sixteen years here that has not been done equally in other states where they have no woman's suffrage. Our political "ring" remains as corrupt as ever, and the addition of women's votes in the downtown districts, has been only to double its purchasable vote.

Mrs. E. B. Field, Jr., of Denver, writes:

I cannot see that the advent of women in politics has in any way

improved conditions and it has only had the effect of driving to the polls thousands of women who did not wish to vote, but who were forced to do so to offset, in a measure, the votes of the undesirable part of the female population who have the reputation of voting early and often. I am sure that I voice the opinion of a large percentage of Colorado women when I make the statement that we should be glad to see the franchise withdrawn.

Mrs. W. H. Dickson, also of Denver, expresses a similar opinion:

Woman's suffrage, so far as I can see, has produced no good effect. It has not improved politics in the state, and it only makes a number of votes that can be bought, or given through friendship, because women, as a rule, do not understand politics.

If space permitted, similar expressions of opinion might be quoted from Miss Harriet P. Farnsworth, Miss Helen L. Ballou, Miss Carolyn H. Marbourg and Mrs. M. H. Williams of Colorado Springs, and Mrs. Harry English, Mrs. Charles MacA. Willcox, Mrs. E. B. Field, Sr., Mrs. Harry K. Brown, Mrs. W. P. McPhee, Miss Genevieve Chandler Phipps, Mrs. Henry J. Hersey, Mrs. Louie F. Spratlin, Mrs. J. B. Hunter, and Mrs. Lester B. Bridham of Denver, all of whom write to *The Ladies' Journal* in corroboration of Mrs. Goddard. Such a volume of testimony as this, from well-informed sources, is not to be lightly dismissed.

A HINDRANCE AND A BURDEN

IN the course of time, I became, through literature alone, a householder, a property-owner, a taxpayer, and the regular employer of five persons. My experience, therefore, has been more varied than that of most women, and I know something of the interests both of the woman who works and of the woman property-owner, the taxpayer and the employer. I can say with positiveness that there never was a moment when the possession of a vote would not have been a hindrance and a burden to me.

—From *"The Ladies' Battle"* by Molly Elliot Seawell.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE Vote of 255 to 88 in favor of the so-called "Conciliation bill" on its second reading in the House of Commons, May 5th, is described by the suffragists as "an overwhelming victory." But there are two facts regarding this vote which the suffragists find it convenient to ignore. One is that, although the suffrage majority was 57 larger than on the suffrage bill voted on July 12th, 1910, the actual suffrage vote was 44 smaller than on the earlier occasion. Last year, 299 members voted for suffrage; this year, only 255. The other fact is that the suffrage members of the House of Commons, as recorded May 5th, so far from constituting "an overwhelming majority" of that body, comprised actually only a little more than one-third of the membership, namely, 255 members out of a total of 670. What really happened May 5th was not that the suffragist voting strength was increased, but that, for one reason or another, a larger proportion of the members who are indifferent or opposed failed to record their votes.

On the day when this vote was taken, there was presented to the House of Commons a petition against woman suffrage bearing 53,000 signatures, of which 31,000 were those of women. That the women anti-suffragists, in England as well as in this country, represent the great majority of their sex, is conclusively shown by the canvass which has been made of women municipal electors in 75 parliamentary districts. In these districts there are altogether 94,181 women who have the municipal ballot. These women were canvassed as to their views upon the grant of the parliamentary ballot. Of the whole number, 37,071 made no reply, which indicates at least that they have no consuming desire for parliamentary suffrage. There were 7,223 who declared themselves neutral, 14,002 who

recorded themselves in favor of suffrage, and 35,879 who declared against it. In other words, of these 94,181 women municipal electors, less than one in six desire the larger ballot.

It has been mistakenly assumed, not only by suffragists but by newspapers generally, that the vote in the Nevada legislature this year, in favor of a suffrage amendment to the constitution, was conclusive, so far as legislative action is concerned, and that the amendment would be submitted for ratification in November, 1912, as in Oregon and Kansas. This is not the case, however. Under the constitution of Nevada, amendments require the favorable action of two successive legislatures before they can be submitted. The suffrage amendment, therefore, must be approved by the legislature chosen in 1912, and meeting in January, 1913, before it can be submitted at the election in November, 1914.

WOMEN teachers in the public schools of Springfield were recently canvassed by the suffragists, with the full expectation that a strong preponderance of suffrage sentiment would be disclosed among them. But the result was nearly as discouraging as the canvasses of Wellesley College and the girls of the Franklin Square House, to which reference was made in the last REMONSTRANCE. Of the Springfield teachers, 7 per cent made no reply, 36 per cent were in doubt, 29 per cent were emphatically opposed and only 28 per cent were in favor.

In spite of parades and petitions and marchings up and down the New York legislature remains obdurate on the suffrage question. The Assembly, May 10th, by a vote of 38 ayes to 90 noes, defeated a motion to request the Rules Committee to place on the calendar the Speilberg resolution for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution. This action disposed of the question for this year.

The chairman of the suffrage legislative committee states that this vote "was not so large against us as might have been expected," a statement which reads queerly in view of the confident predictions made earlier.

"MAN MADE LAWS"

SUFFRAGISTS express great distaste for what they call "man-made laws." They insist that only by granting women the ballot can society be assured of good laws for the protection of women and children and the general regeneration of society. Yet they betray a curious irritation when a comparison is made between the legislation of suffrage and non-suffrage states. Two legislatures this year have acted favorably on bills to limit the hours of labor for women and children in factories to fifty-four hours a week. Are they suffrage states, — Colorado or Idaho, for example, — which are taking this step? Not at all. They are non-suffrage states, New York and Massachusetts.

An ex-governor of Idaho was brought on this year to describe to the New York legislators what woman suffrage had done for his state and how much the women of New York need it. This suggested to Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, chairman of the legislative committee of the New York State Association **Opposed to Woman Suffrage**, a comparison of the laws of the two states.

Miss Chittenden found that in New York a married woman controls her own earnings; in Idaho a husband controls everything his wife earns. In New York a married woman can hold her property entirely free from the control of her husband. In Idaho, a married woman can get control of her property only by going into court and showing that her husband is mismanaging it. In New York, husband and wife are equal guardians of their children. In Idaho the husband is the legal guardian. In New York there is only one ground upon which absolute divorce may be procured. In Idaho there are seven. New York limits the hours in which a woman may be employed. Idaho fixes no limit.

On the whole, are not "man-made laws" just, not to say generous, toward the women?

"MEN WITH FOREIGN NAMES" TABOOED

IRRITATED by the activity of Senator Grady of New York in shelving the suffrage bill in the New York legislature, Dr. Anna Shaw, on the eve of her departure for Europe, expressed herself with a good deal of freedom. As reported in the New York Mail-Express for May 25th, Dr. Shaw declared that "Senator Grady and men like him, bearing foreign names, should not have the right to vote on a question of this sort," and she added: "The cause will not have the impetus which will bring success until men with American names are elected to the legislature and Congress."

Dr. Shaw is President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, and, more than any one else, may rightly be regarded as the representative of that organization and the suffrage movement. Does such an utterance as that quoted above, placing a ban upon all citizens "bearing foreign names" because one of them has voted against woman suffrage, suggest the possession of that intelligence, judgment and mental balance which are needed in politics?

THE WISCONSIN BILL

AN unusual question is suggested by the woman suffrage bill just enacted by the Wisconsin legislature. The bill takes the form of an amendment to section 12 of the statutes of Wisconsin, making it read "Every person male or female" etc.; and the amendment is to take effect if approved by a vote of the people in November, 1912.

But the qualifications for the suffrage are established in Wisconsin by the constitution of the state, which expressly limits the suffrage to "male" persons of 21 years and upward. And the constitution expressly provides, in article 12, that amendments can become a part of the constitution only after the favorable action of two successive legis-

latures, followed by ratification by the people.

How these plain constitutional provisions can be circumvented by a referendum on a bill enacted by a single legislature is a mystery which seems to call for an explanation.

The only explanation thus far vouchsafed, contained in the Milwaukee Journal for June 23d, is that when the constitution says "Every male person" etc. it "does not specifically either include or exclude females" and that therefore women may be given the ballot by legislative act and a referendum, under a later and subordinate clause which permits the inclusion of new classes of voters by that method. But in Wisconsin as in other states with exactly the same clause in their constitutions, the expression "Every male person" must surely, by implication, exclude females. It will be interesting to see what view the courts take of this attempt to evade the constitution.

SUFFRAGE LOSING GROUND IN CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT suffragists are used to having their hopes raised by the favorable action of one branch of the legislature only to have them dashed by the adverse vote of the other. But this year, when the Governor strongly urged municipal suffrage for women, and the Senate passed a bill by a vote of 14 to 9, they brought every possible pressure to bear upon the House and were sanguine of success. But when the bill came up in the House, June 7th, it was summarily rejected by a vote of 168 to 49—or almost four to one.

The last time that the Connecticut House went on record on a municipal suffrage bill was in 1907. The bill was then rejected by a vote of 86 to 56. The net result, therefore, of four years of suffrage agitation in Connecticut is an absolute falling-off in the suffrage vote in the legislature, while the anti-suffrage vote has nearly doubled.

One cause which contributed powerfully to this result was the activity of the anti-suffrage women. They appeared at the legislative hearing, and, when the bill was pending in the House, 63 petitions against its passage, signed by hundreds of women

in all parts of the state, were sent in. These petitions declared:

In spite of the demand of a few insistent women, the large majority of women in this state have not asked for and do not wish any further extension of the suffrage and the attendant burdens which it would force upon them.

SUFFRAGE DEFEAT IN ILLINOIS

THE Illinois House, May 17th, by a vote of 68 to 71, refused to suspend the rules to consider the suffrage bill which passed the Senate, March 23d.

The bill thus finally defeated applied the principle of local option to the suffrage proposition. It provided that each political district should have local option on woman suffrage. If the city of Chicago, for instance, were to vote for the proposition on a referendum, the women there would have a vote on city officers. If a county were to endorse it, women in that county could vote for county officers. If the entire state were to accept it by a referendum vote, the women of the state would be privileged to vote for state officers.

Against this extraordinary bill, which would have led to indescribable confusion if it had been enacted, the Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women labored with its usual energy and resolution, and is to be congratulated upon its success.

A REVOLT AGAINST NATURE

I CONSIDER the agitation for woman suffrage an attempt to revolt against nature. Nature has given to either sex its peculiar work:—woman's sphere is the home; man's sphere the world outside the home. This is not a new theory. It has been the same from the very beginning of civilization and it will be the same to the end of time. Most other things: the various usages or practices in government, the laws and institutions, the customs and fashions,—everything has undergone a perpetual change and development; but the relative conditions of the sexes have remained what they were. Nature has its unchangeable laws, has a constitution of its own and one that cannot be improved or amended like the constitution of a state or the Constitution of the United States.

—Extract from speech of the Hon. C. H. Dormer, in the Wisconsin Assembly.